

## **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Non-Final Office Action mailed June 4, 2010. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 2, 6 - 9, 13, 16, 17, 20 and 21 remain pending. In particular, Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 13, 20 and 21, and cancels claims 3 - 5, 10 - 12, 14, 15, 18 and 19 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicant cancels claims 3 - 5, 10 - 12, 14, 15, 18 and 19 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **I. Claim Objections**

In the Office Action, claims 2, 6, 12 and 21 are objected to because of various informalities. In response thereto, the Applicant has amended claims 2, 6 and 21 and cancelled the claim 12, thereby accommodating the objections.

### **II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

In the office action, claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In addition, claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response thereto, the Applicant has amended the claims 20-21, thereby accommodating the rejections.

### III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action indicates that claims 1, 2, 9, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0158835 (“*Kobayashi*”). Applicant respectfully traverses.

#### A. Claim 1 is Allowable Over *Kobayashi*

In this regard, claim 1 recites:

1. An electroluminescent device comprising:
  - a substrate;
  - a support layer having a plurality of recesses and being disposed on the substrate;
  - a light emissive structure on the substrate, the light emissive structure comprising organic light emissive material disposed between first and second electrode layers for supplying charge carriers into the organic light emissive material to cause it to emit light, and the first and second electrode layers respectively underlying and overlying the organic light emissive material in a first recess of the plurality of recesses; and
  - an electrically conductive region underlying the light emissive structure in a second recess of the plurality of recesses, the second electrode layer and the organic light emissive material extending to the second recess, wherein ***the electrically conductive region is formed with electrically conductive protuberances which extend through the thickness of the organic light emissive material, the second electrode layer is electrically connected to the electrically conductive protuberances, and the organic light emissive material partially covers the electrically conductive protuberances.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that the cited art is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 1. In particular, the cited art does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features emphasized above in claim 1.

As currently amended, claim 1 recites the limitation of “the electrically conductive region is formed with electrically conductive protuberances which extend through the thickness of the organic light emissive material, the second electrode layer is electrically connected to the electrically conductive protuberances, and the organic light emissive material partially covers the electrically conductive protuberances” which is not disclosed by *Kobayashi*. Support for amendment to claim 1 can be found at least in Fig. 6 and its associated description beginning

on page 10, as well as original claim 4. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

**B. Claim 9 is Allowable Over Kobayashi**

Claim 9, as amended, recites:

9. A method of fabricating an electroluminescent device comprising:  
forming a support layer having a plurality of recesses on a substrate;  
fabricating an electrically conductive region on the substrate in a second recess of the plurality of recesses, wherein ***the electrically conductive region is formed with electrically conductive protuberances***;  
fabricating a light emissive structure on the substrate, the light emissive structure comprising organic light emissive material disposed between first and second electrode layers for supplying charge carriers into the organic light emissive material to cause it to emit light, the first and second electrode layers respectively underlying and overlying the organic light emissive material in a first recess of the plurality of recesses, the second electrode layer and the organic light emissive material extending to the second recess and the electrically conductive region underlying the light emissive structure such that the electrically conductive protuberances extend through the thickness of the organic light emissive material, ***the second electrode layer is electrically connected to the electrically conductive protuberances, and the organic light emissive material partially covers the electrically conductive protuberances***.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that the cited art is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 9. In particular, the cited art does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features emphasized above in claim 9.

As currently amended, claim 9 recites the limitation of “the electrically conductive region is formed with electrically conductive protuberances” and “the second electrode layer and the organic light emissive material extending to the second recess and the electrically conductive region underlying the light emissive structure such that the electrically conductive protuberances extend through the thickness of the organic light emissive material, the second electrode layer is electrically connected to the electrically conductive protuberances, and the organic light emissive material partially covers the electrically conductive protuberances” which is not disclosed by *Kobayashi*. Support for amendment to claim 9 can be found at least in Fig.

6 and its associated description beginning on page 10, as well as original claim 14. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

**C. Claims 2, 16 and 17 are Allowable Over *Kobayashi***

Dependent claim 2 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 1. Dependent claims 16 and 17 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 9. See *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Additionally, these claims recite other features that can serve as independent bases for patentability.

**IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action indicates that claims 3 and 10 – 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kobayashi* in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0041149 (“*Shimoda*”). Additionally, claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kobayashi* in view of *Goto* and *Hosokawa*, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kobayashi* in view of *Goto*, and claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kobayashi* in view of *Tyan*.

In this regard, Applicant has cancelled claims 3-5, 10-12 and 14, and respectfully asserts that the rejections as to these claims have been rendered moot. With respect to claims 6-8, these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. Notably, the secondary reference (*Tyan*) does not remedy the deficiencies of the cited art described above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Additionally, dependent claim 13 depends from allowable independent claim 9 and the secondary reference (*Shimoda*) does not remedy the deficiencies of the cited art described above with respect to the rejection of claim 9. Therefore, these claims are believed to be allowable. See *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*,

303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Additionally, these claims recite other features that can serve as independent bases for patentability.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



---

**M. Paul Qualey, Jr., Reg. No. 43,024**

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1500  
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500